

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are presently active.

In the Office Action dated 19 August 2003 ("Office Action"), claims 1-20 were objected to because of informalities; claims 1, 9-10, 17-18, and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Citta, US patent 4,190,862 ("Citta"); and claims 2-8, 11-16, and 19 were rejected under U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Citta in view of Parham, US patent 4,159,448 ("Parham") and further in view of Li, US patent 6,137,375 ("Li").

Informalities are corrected in the claims as suggested in the Office Action. An informality is also corrected in the specification.

Applicants respectfully believe that the cited references are not applicable to the present invention. Citta teaches a transistor for charging a capacitor and a current source to discharge the capacitor. See Citta, column 9, lines 57-66. However, claim 1 recites a capacitor charged by a first current source and discharged by a transistor. Nowhere does Citta teach or suggest the use of a current source to charge a capacitor and a transistor to discharge the capacitor. Likewise, claim 9 recites a first current source to charge the capacitor, and also recites where a combination of a transistor and a second current source discharges the capacitor. Similar comments apply to claim 17. Claim 20, although not reciting a current source, nevertheless recites discharging the capacitor by conducting drain current through a FET.

Accordingly, all of the independent claims of the present invention are very different from that taught or suggested by Citta.

Parham is cited merely for teaching a nMOSFET having a gate voltage responsive to a capacitor voltage difference, and Li is cited merely for the use of a pMOSFET in place of a nMOSFET. But nowhere does Parham or Li teach or suggest that the pMOSFET (or nMOSFET) is the transistor that discharges the capacitor.

Accordingly, the combination of cited references does not teach or suggest the claim limitations of the present application, and Applicants therefore believe that the claims of the present application are patentable over the cited references.

Respectfully submitted,

Seth Z. Kalson Dated: 12-17-03

Seth Z. Kalson
Reg. no. 40,670
Attorney for Intel Corporation (Assignee)